

Applic. No.: 10/635,737  
Amdt. Dated February 21, 2006  
Reply to Office action of December 20, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 15 and 19-22 remain in the application. Claims 15 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-14 have been previously cancelled. Claims 16-18 have now been cancelled. Claims 21-22 are allowed.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 15 and 17 have been rejected as being anticipated by Guillory et al. (US 5,925,889) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In item 4 on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 16 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Guillory et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejection has been noted and claim 15 has been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. More specifically, the features of claims 17-18 have been added to claim 15. Since claim 18 contains allowable subject matter as indicated in item 6 on page 3 of the Office action, claim 15 is now believed to be allowable. Claims 16-17 have been cancelled.

Applic. No.: 10/635,737  
Amdt. Dated February 21, 2006  
Reply to Office action of December 20, 2005

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's statement in item 5 on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action that claims 21-22 are allowed.

Applicants also acknowledge the Examiner's statement in item 6 on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action that claims 18-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The feature of claim 18 has been added to claim 15. Claim 19 has been written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since claim 20 is dependent on allowable claim 19, it is believed to be allowable in dependent form.

In view of the foregoing, an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance of claims 15 and 19-22 is solicited.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested as it is believed to place the application in better condition

Applic. No.: 10/635,737  
Amdt. Dated February 21, 2006  
Reply to Office action of December 20, 2005

for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of  
search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition  
for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which  
might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to  
the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-  
1099.

Respectfully submitted,

  
For Applicants

Yonghong Chen  
Reg. No. 56,156

YC

February 21, 2006

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101